



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—NOTES FROM THE GREEK SEMINARY.

I.

THE ARTICULAR INFINITIVE IN XENOPHON AND PLATO.

In a paper on the articular infinitive, published in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1878, I presented some statistics collected by my pupils and myself as to the usage of Homer, Pindar, the Dramatic poets, Herodotos and Thukydides, and more especially the Attic orators. Those who are at the pains to gather statistics are too prone to read results into them, and, as the papers I have recently published have been chiefly statistical, it may seem to some that I too have the census-bureau ideal of philology. Statistic, as has been well said, is a dead thing, if not animated by the spirit that presents the points of view from which the statements are to be made. The phenomena must be vital, must be organic, else counting is of no moment. If the investigator has not a proper appreciation of the object of his search, he occupies no higher place than the notorious Caravella, who has left us a record of all the particles in Aristophanes arranged according to the accent, μέν in one group and μέν in another; or than Bindseil, who in his concordance to Pindar has put ὅς for ἔως under the relative, and made no distinction between ἄν the adverb-preposition and ἄν the particle. The mania of the present time is special syntax, and perhaps I am no more free from it than is any other philologist who desires to work in and with his time; but too much of this research is done by very young men, generally with no adequate knowledge of the history of constructions and often in slavish dependence on the theories of their teachers. In order to raise the structure of historical syntax on a sufficiently broad foundation, a division of the work is necessary. This every one recognizes. But it is important that force should not be wasted, even should M. Renan be right and historical studies be near their end by reason of the exhaustion of material. At all events I have endeavored not to throw away my own time nor the time of others in the observation of phenomena which possess no discernible significance. But the question comes up, Who is to judge of the significance? Do

we not leave too much to the subjective standard? Of course that is the trouble with every department of study into which feeling and imagination enter so largely as they do in the case of language. Familiarity with the current of a language makes the student susceptible to slight changes, unnoticed by those who get their knowledge out of grammars, which generally present illustrations, not proofs, and seldom if ever show any sense of proportion. The total impression of style, if carefully watched, breaks itself up into a series of minor impressions, and statistic comes in to give an exact account of the source of feeling. It is in this way that we can speak of the aesthetics of syntax. Not that I would leave too much to impression. The logical network of categories is often extremely useful; more useful, however, in exclusion, if I may dare say so, than in inclusion, for although students are aware theoretically that languages differ very much in their spheres of expression, many of them fail to discern the blanks in various idioms, and force the unlucky Greek or the unlucky Latin to assume shapes unknown to the peoples who used these tongues. So parallel syntaxes are found full of enforced parallelisms which a proper use of categories would have excluded.¹ The Greek did not want a parallel to the Latin, nor the Roman to the Greek. Translation is not made by parallels but by equivalents.²

¹ A good many years ago, when I was nursing the project of a parallel syntax of Greek and Latin, I sent for a book then recently published, half hoping, half fearing to find the work done to my hand. The book still figures in "complete" lists of grammars, and a word of warning may be not in vain. The author is a Dr. Havestadt, evidently an admirer of Bäumlein, and the book was published in Emmerich, 1863. Such ignorance of Greek I have seldom encountered in any quarter to which one might look for light, although the ignorance does not yield such delicious nonsense as one finds, for instance, in the "key" to a very popular Greek prose composition. So Cic. Off. 1, 14: sunt multi qui eripiunt aliis *quod* aliis *largiantur* is rendered by Havestadt πολλοὶ εἰσιν, οἱ ἀναρπάζουσιν ἄλλοις (oder gewöhnlicher: ἀναρπάζοντες), ἃ ἄλλοις δωρῶνται; and 3, 5: sibi ut quisque malit, quod ad usum vitae pertineat, quam alteri acquirere concessum est, *non repugnante natura* = μὴ οὐκ ἐναντιοῦσθης τῆς φύσεως = ohne dass die Natur im Widerspruche ist. Tusc. 1, 39: Natura dedit usuram vitae, tamquam pecuniae, *nulla praestituta die* = μὴ οὐκ ἀποτεταγμένης τῆς ἡμέρας = ohne dass ein Termin gesetzt wird. I spare the Hellenist the superfluity of *sic*'s and exclamation points.

² A Hellenist is prone to exaggerate the influence of Greek on Latin, and yet after making all deductions it is hard to resist the conviction that Latin syntax was sophisticated not only by the adoption of certain Greek constructions, but by the unceasing effort of Roman translators and imitators to reproduce the

The Greek infinitive has a life of its own, and a richer and more subtle development than can be found in any of the cognate languages. This is recognized, I believe, by all professed students of comparative grammar, even by those who only know Greek as it is presented in Kühner. Of course the "ethnic" grammarians are not only proud of this concession, but avail themselves of it to the extent of insisting on a practical independence outside of a limited range of phenomena. The verbalization of the infinitive, so to speak, and the return of the infinitive to the substantive with the retention of its enlarged verb-force, are to be measured inside of the Greek language rather than outside of it. If the ethnic grammarians are over-cautious as to proethnic theories, they err on the right side.

By the substantial loss of its dative force the infinitive became verbalized; by the assumption of the article it was substantivized again with a decided increment of its power. This process adumbrated in Homer we find carried one easy step forward in Pindar. It must have existed among the people long before it was suffered to enter the domain of art. Such expressions as τὸ φαγεῖν, τὸ πίνειν must have been common far earlier than our record. Philosophers found it a welcome instrument. Parmenides uses it with a certain defiance of law. There are not many τὸ οὐκ εἶναι's in true Greek.¹ Pindar limits himself to the acc. and nom., and uses

effect of Greek combinations, to which the cultivated Romans must have been more sensitive than most of us can pretend to be. So *cum* with the subjunctive, which is a later extension of the relative with the subj., owes much of its popularity to the struggle with the Greek participle, something, perhaps, to the reproduction of the tone of *ἥνίκα* as distinguished from *ὅτε*; *ut* consecutive is a handy formula for *ὥστε* with the infinitive; the negative *μή* brings about the subjunctive, as in the Roman age of Greek the Latin subjunctive brings about the negative *nō*. Comparatively poor in poetic diction, the Roman poet made amends as the French poet did and still does to some extent by varying the normal order of words. Careful dovetailers like Horace had in this respect as in in others a keen eye to the *exemplaria Graeca*, and the relative has been the greatest sufferer. In Greek poetry—notably in Pindar—the relative can take positions which are seemingly bold, because in Greek we feel the interchangeableness with the demonstrative. There is no such kinship in Latin, and it would not be too daring to say that wherever the interrogative would be forced the relative would be forced.

¹ Parmen. v. 50 οἷς τὸ πέλειν τε καὶ οὐκ εἶναι ταῦτ' ὀν νόμισται | κοῦ ταῦτόν. In my article "Encroachments of *μή* on *οὐ*" (*American Journal of Philol.* I 46), I called Winer's τὸ οὐ φαγεῖν an impossibility, and I am not sorry for it. For such "sports" no one is responsible. So Babrius runs counter to the law of the

these chiefly in the aorist. The dramatic poets vary. Aischylos uses the articular inf. chiefly in the acc. and nom., the tenses are present and aorist; of prepositions he uses very few and these very sparingly; Sophokles employs prepositions a little more frequently, but in him also the tenses are all present or aorist, counting present perfects as presents. Every one knows that Sophokles is highly individual in his syntax, and we have one remarkable instance of a substantivized *oratio obliqua*, Antig. 235, 6 :

τῆς ἐλπίδος γὰρ ἔρχομαι δεδραγμένος
τὸ μὴ παθεῖν ἂν ἄλλο πλὴν τὸ μόρσιμον.

Euripides is even more conservative than his rival in the proportion of his employment of the articular infin. He too uses prepositions and quasi-prepositions very sparingly and keeps to the present and aorist tenses. The construction had not yet become pliant enough for his purpose. Aristophanes is a more difficult problem, because the parodic element enters and the popular as well. He uses the articular infinitive less frequently than Aischylos and Sophokles, but still much oftener than Euripides. The bulk consists of nominatives and accusatives. The tenses are present and aorist. Prepositions are sparingly employed.

To turn to prose. Herodotos uses the articular infinitive very rarely in comparison with Thukydides, who was the first writer to appreciate its possibilities. The tenses used are present and aorist; the perfect once, of resulting condition, nearly = present (4, 6). There are few prepositions, and the examples increase toward the end of the work. The bulk of Thukydides is only six to Herodotos' seven, and yet he uses the articular infinitive more than eight times as

language when he says, 50, 1: ὁ δ' οὐ προδῶσεν ὤμνε. Who cares? I may add in this obscure corner that the article referred to was wrung from me by the necessity of making a beginning with the Journal, most of my friends having left me in the lurch. Hence the extreme modesty with which I presented my results. I only used Lucian as an *a fortiori* argument. If such a thing is done in such an author, what must one not expect in writers far inferior to Lucian? I had watched the phenomena for many years, and had stated my results three years before in my commentary to Justin Martyr; and while I shared the regret of some of my critics that I had limited the exhibit to Lucian, I did not require the admonition of Dr. E. Ziegeler, who informed me in the *Philologische Rundschau* of April 30, 1881, that "ὅτι μὴ is the regular construction after verbs of emotion in older Greek," to the damage of his own reputation for scholarship in the eyes of those who do not accept the uniform "Alles-besserwissen" of German critics of low degree as well as high.

often and with great freedom. The genitive and dative are liberally employed. Instead of a sparing use of prepositions he indulges in the construction without stint (fifteen different prepositions), and absolutely riots in the use of *διὰ τό*. Present and aorist tenses preponderate, but the perfect is also used, and, which is especially worthy of note, the articular future infinitive and the articular inf. with *ἄν*. Thus the spoils of *oratio obliqua* are appropriated by the resuscitated and reinvigorated nominal infinitive. It is a bold use, and found few imitators in the whole range of the classic tongue. In the rest of my paper, which I am now summarizing for the better appreciation of some new statistics, I presented the results of some researches which I instituted into the usage of the orators. Taking the Teubner page as a standard, it will be found that the occurrences are at least approximately :

Lysias12
Andokides20
Isaios25
Aischines30
Antiphon50
Lykurgos60
Isokrates60
Deinarchos80
Demosthenes (private orations)80
“ (public orations)	1.25

I shall not here repeat my interpretation of these facts. If the figures mean anything, they mean that the use of the articular inf. is not simply a matter of period, but a matter of individual character and artistic school.

Two of the members of my Greek seminary have undertaken of their own motion to fill the gaps in my presentation by looking up the usage of Xenophon and Plato. The Platonic statistic is, of course, much complicated by the question of genuineness, and the young investigator, who did the Platonic work as a *πάρειργον* to an exhaustive study of *ἐπὶ* in the same author, has limited his range to the dialogues accepted by Teuffel. Plato's syntax is so various, it holds in solution so much, it suggests so much conscious playing with language, that no author requires a more circumspect handling. Von Stein well says that Plato writes an ideal style for an ideal reader. A man devoid of humor has no business with Plato, as he can have very little pleasure in him ; and the grammarian who is not willing to be surprised and tickled should shut himself up with Isokrates, although even Isokrates

plays us tricks at times, startles us by a picturesque expression, and puzzles us by an anomalous negative and an erratic participle.

The papers to which I refer were written, the one on Xenophon by George Frederick Nicolassen, Ph. D., the other by Mr. W. S. Fleming, Scholar of the Johns Hopkins University, and I take from each of these essays such points as seem to me of special interest in connexion with the statements already made. From Mr. Nicolassen's paper on the articular infinitive in Xenophon it appears that the tenses in Xenophon are mostly the present and the aorist, as was to be expected, sometimes the perfect, and in a few instances the fut. inf. and the inf. with *ἄν* due to the influence of *oratio obliqua*. So Fut.: Anab. 2, 4, 19; 3, 2, 24; Mem. 2, 1, 18 (with *ἐλπίς*); Conv. 3, 3 (with *ἀντιλέγει*). Inf. with *ἄν*: Hell. 1, 4, 20; 3, 3, 6; Mem. 3, 13, 1; Vect. 3, 7 (*οὐ δύσελπίς εἰμι*). Of the cases the nom. and accusative largely preponderate. Then comes the genitive, which is freely used. It is freely used by Euripides, we shall see it freely used by Plato, and Mr. Nicolassen notes especially the comparatively rare construction of the articular infinitive as gen. absolute (Mem. 2, 7, 8). The rarity is doubtless due to the fact that the natural construction would be the simple inf. with the acc. participle. The articular inf. with the acc. participle is also rare (Cyr. 2, 2, 20). Prepositions appear in great numbers and variety. Prepositions proper: *ἀντί*, *ἀπό*, *ἐξ*, *πρό*, *ἐν*, *εἰς*, *διά* with gen. and acc., *ὑπέρ* with gen., *ἐπί* with dat. and acc., *περί* with gen. and acc., *πρός* with dat. and acc. Prepositions improper: *ἐνεκα*, *ἄνευ*, *μέχρι*, *ἐγγύς*, *ἄμα*. *Διά* with the accus. is a favorite as it was with Thukydides; while *εἰς*, though frequently used, is not used in overwhelming numbers, as in certain spheres of later Greek. Mr. Nicolassen's table of percentages is interesting:

	Pages (Teubner ed.)	Art. Inf.	Av.
Anabasis	. . . 244	89	.36
Hellenica	. . . 275	137	.49
Cyropaed.	. . . 318	372	1.17
Mem.	. . . 142	254	1.79
Oec.	. . . 71	82	1.15
Conv.	. . . 38	50	1.32
Hier.	. . . 25	47	1.88
Agasil.	. . . 32	57	1.78
R. L.	. . . 21	42	2.
R. A.	. . . 13	4	.31
Vect.	. . . 16	17	1.06

Hipp.	.	.	.	24	64	2.67
Eq.	.	.	.	27	51	1.89
Cyn.	.	.	.	36	28	.75
Apol.	.	.	.	8	19	2.38
				<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
				1290	1313	Gen. Av. 1.02

The difference between the maximum in the Hipparchikos (2.67) which comes into the neighborhood of Demosthenes' highest range (First Olynthiac 2.75) and the Resp. Athen. is noteworthy, especially in view of the manifest un-Xenophontean character of the latter, which is generally assigned to an earlier period. Of course Mr. Nicolassen has not failed to notice this low average, "which is less than the average in the Cynegeticus, which among the minor works has the next lowest average (.75), and far below the average of all the minor works together 1.48," and he justly considers this point to have cumulative weight. The Kynegetikos, I would add, is grammatically a remarkable production, and I have always thought that some of its peculiarities were due to the conservatism of the language of venery.¹ Xenophon in his way has considerable

¹I have purposely avoided making any critical application of the statistics given above except in the case of the notorious Republic of the Athenians. Dr. Lincke, the author of the tract on the Oikonomikos, reviewed by Professor C. D. Morris in Vol. I, pp. 169-186 of this Journal, has recently published an article, *Zur Xenophonkritik*, which is not without interest (Hermes, XVII 2). A summary of it will be given in an early number of the Journal. The main theme of the paper is the composition of the Anabasis and the Kynegetikos. Dr. Lincke does not seem to be acquainted with Professor Seymour's essay on the Kynegetikos published in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1878, and limits his *ἀνέτησις*, as others have done before him, to the opening and closing chapters. According to Dr. Lincke, the editor of both Anabasis and Kynegetikos knew Xenophon personally and heard and learned much from him. This would account for the general Xenophontean character, while the variations are to be ascribed to the "hollow head" of the youthful admirer and imitator. But I leave Xenophontean critics to deal with Dr. Lincke, whose method in this essay seems to be as unsatisfactory as it was in the other. Still it must be conceded to the aggressive critics that a work like the Kynegetikos would lend itself very readily to interpolations, indeed almost as readily as a book of recipes; but Xenophon himself was so impressionable that too much stress must not be laid on inconsistency of style. What if the Kynegetikos does produce the effect, now of rude notes taken down from hunters, now of sophistic ornamentation got up by the composer of the treatise? The combination of high-flown rhetoric, homely realism and absurd story-telling is not peculiar to the sportsman Xenophon, and curious parallels might be adduced from the hunting literature of modern times and, in fact, of our own

variety, but a variety which is due not so much to the artistic mobility of a genius like Plato as to the *laisser-aller* of an antique soldier of fortune, and it is only when he gathers himself up that it is fair to compare him with those who are the true representatives of Attic prose-speech at its conscious best—the Attic orators. If we examine the speeches and the portraits of Anabasis and Hellenika, the low averages above given will disappear, as a very slight inspection of the occurrences will show.¹

Of especial interest is Mr. Nicolassen's comparison of Xenophon with Thukydides. The average of Thukydides is .98, that of Xenophon 1.02. The slight difference may be accounted for, as Mr. Nicolassen accounts for it, by the philosophical character of so many of Xenophon's writings, as witness the large percentage of the Kyrupaideia and the Memorabilia. In my essay on the articular infinitive I said that I was very much inclined to think that Xenophon was influenced by Thukydides, and I am not surprised to find that while the average of *διά* with the articular inf. falls a little below that of Thukydides, who has a mania for it, still it rises to its height in the Hellenika, as Mr. Nicolassen notes.

In making this comparison with Thukydides, Mr. Nicolassen has had to rely on Forssmann, *De infinitivi temporum usu Thucydideo* (Curtius' Studien VI 1), although he has detected Forssmann in some inaccuracies. Of course absolute accuracy is desirable in everything, but approximate results are not without their interest and value. Sometimes when the preponderance is enormous we can afford to neglect the small dust of the balance. In Xenophon's case, all that can be expected is the exhibition of a general coincidence with the standard language. A model Xenophon has long ceased to be, even though in some eyes he has gained a more human interest by the ruthless treatment he has of late

day. While looking into Mr. Nicolassen's examples I note that the twenty-seven examples in the Kylenegetikos are distributed thus: Nom. 5, 34; 6, 8; 12, 19; 13, 4. Acc. 5, 28. Gen. 6, 4; 7, 9; *ἀπό* w. gen. 4, 4; *ἀνευ* w. gen. 4, 10; *ἐγγίς* w. gen. 12, 5; *διά* w. acc. 5, 5; 5, 9; 8, 3; 8, 8; 9, 10; 9, 17; 10, 22; 12, 2; 12, 3 (*bis*); 12, 6; 12, 7; 12, 16; 12, 21; *ἐπὶ* w. acc. 12, 15, with dat. 13, 8; *πρός* w. acc. 5, 27. The introduction has none, eleven are crowded into the last chapters (argumentative). *Διά* with acc. has its large Xenophontean share.

¹ Take for instance the nom. art. inf., list of the Anabasis: 1, 9, 24 (*bis*); 2, 1, 4; 2, 4, 19; 2, 5, 15; 2, 6, 14 (*bis*); 3, 2, 39 (*bis*); 5, 2, 9; 5, 6, 32; 5, 8, 15; 6, 1, 26; 6, 5, 17 (*bis*); 6, 5, 18; 7, 7, 26; 7, 7, 28. All these examples with only one exception, and that really no exception, occur in speeches or elaborate characteristics.

received. I have been careful not to make a minute abstract of Mr. Nicolassen's essay, which will be prepared for publication in another form, perhaps in connexion with a treatise on the whole subject from the beginning of Greek literature to the close of the oratorical canon.

Mr. W. S. Fleming's notes on the articular infinitive in Plato go into less detail than Mr. Nicolassen's essay, and are restricted, as I have said, to the dialogues considered genuine by Teuffel, thus excluding with others, for which little can be said, the Menexenos and the Parmenides. Plato uses twenty-five prepositions and quasi-prepositions as against fifteen in Thukydides. Among the more uncommon I note *κατά* (eight times). The genitive is nearly as common as the nominative (415:468). The acc. leads (632). The dative is much less frequent than the others. In phrases the infinitive itself is often a dative still. The gen. absol. construction occurs Crito 44 D, Polit. 310 E, Euthyd. 285 D, Gorgias 509 C. In the dialogues examined the articular present infinitive is much more common than the aorist, occurring in fact nine times oftener. This is a marked contrast to the Pindaric use, where the aorist is to the present as seven out of ten. But the Pindaric preponderance of the aorist generally I shall myself consider before long in a special paper. Plato's large use of the present is doubtless due to the philosophical consideration of the character of the action rather than its manifestation. If we exclude present perfects from the list of articular perfect infinitives, such as *τὸ τεθνάναι*, *τὸ μεμνησθαι* and the like, the articular perf. inf. shrinks to a small fraction of the usage. The articular future inf. is rare, twice dependent on *ἐλπίς* Phaedo 68 A, Philebus 36 A; once on *παράδειγμα*, Legg. 664 A. The articular inf. with *ἄν* is also rare. Four out of seven examples are in the Laws, which, I would add, are rich in grammatical oddities. See Phaedo 62 C, Symp. 174 B, Resp. 501 A, Legg. 790 A (*bis*), 879 D, 941 D.

I have allowed myself to present in this bare outline the chief results of the work of these young men in connexion with what I myself have done in this direction, because I am sure that there are many who take a sufficient interest in Greek grammar to follow the history of so important a construction in its larger manifestations, and perhaps even those who value Greek only as an exemplification of general grammatical laws will not be indifferent to this vindication, imperfect as it is, of the reserved rights of the special language and the individual author. Even without putting

into print the enormous mass of material, enough has been done to show that the "foundations of Greek Syntax" in this quarter must be laid on firmer soil than is to be found in any general treatise, however "ausführlich." No language can ever be learned to the end; but it is to be hoped that the younger generation of Greek scholars will not suffer as much reproach to rest on them as rests on their seniors, who have had to learn within my memory some matters which in other languages would be considered elementary.

II.

ὅν μή.

In my edition of the Apologies of Justin Martyr (Harper & Brothers, 1877), I used the notes as a *cache* for various grammatical formulae and observations, some of which I have since endeavored to justify in the pages of this journal. Among the difficult combinations thus summarily treated is *ὅν μή*, on which I made some remarks which I will repeat here.

I, c. 38. *ὅν μή αἰσχυρθῶ*: This emphatic form of the negative (*ὅν μή*) is far more common in the LXX and in the N. T. than it is in classic Greek. This tendency to exaggeration in the use of an adopted language is natural. For Hebrew analogies see Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, S. 320 *a*. The *fact* is that *ὅν μή* with the aor. subj. (very seldom with any other tense) is used as a strong negative of the future. The common *explanation* is that a verb or phrase of fear or apprehension is to be supplied. If this be true, the consciousness of it must have been utterly lost, as the expression is often used when the notion of fear or apprehension would be unnatural to the last degree. The practical limitation to the aorist seems to indicate that the expression was originally imperative (comp. the use of *לֹא* in Hebrew), *ὅν* being a free negative.¹ 'Nay, let me not be ashamed.' Afterwards the imperative notion became fainter. It might seem easier to make *ὅν* belong to *αἰσχυρθῶ*, thus combining objective and subjective negatives, but it must be remembered

¹ According to my judgment the standing perplexity about *οὐκ οὖν*, *οὐκουν*, *οὐκοῦν* is to be solved by the varying use of the negative *οὐκ* now as free, *i. e.* referring to the substance of what goes before, now as bound to the following verb. As free, *οὐκ* would be 'nay,' as bound, 'not.'

that *οὐ* with the subjunctive had died out (except in *μή οὐ*) before this construction came in.¹

I, c. 39. *οὐ μή λήψονται* = *οὐ μή λάβωσι*. *οὐ μή* w. fut. indic. is most frequently used in the second person as a strong imperative. Here it is employed as a strong prediction. The combination is commonly explained as an interrogative and *οὐ* is made to negative the *μή*. This theory of Elmsley's would require *οὐ*—*οὐ* as in Xen. Hell. 5. 2, 33.² A more simple explanation regards *οὐ* and *μή* as both belonging to the future (Goodwin³). But satisfactory examples of the future indicative in an imperative sense are rare. Perhaps it may be best to consider *οὐ* as 'nay!' (see note on c. 38, 9) and *μή* as an interrogative expecting a negative answer.

The foregoing brief statement I subsequently expanded for a special purpose, and this expanded form I now reproduce with a few additional notes.

οὐ μή, in independent sentences, combining as it does both the negative of the statement and the negative of will, carries with it a tone of special personal interest, whether in prediction or in prohibition. *οὐ μή* is used

I. in negative predictions.

a. with Subj.

1. chiefly aor. *οὔ τι μή ληφθῶ δόλω* Aesch. S. c. T. 38, cf. 199, 281, Cho. 895; *οὔτοι σ' Ἀχαιῶν . . . μή τις ὑβρίσῃ* Soph. Ai. 560, cf. El. 42, 1029, Phil. 103, O. R. 771, O. C. 450, 1023; *οὔ τι μή φύγητε λαίψηρῶ ποδὶ* Eur. Hec. 1039, cf. H. F. 718; *οὐ γὰρ μή ἀπώσῃται* Hdt. 1, 199,

¹ *οὐ μή* startles us when it appears in Parmenides, *ε. g.* v. 121 (Mull.): *ὥς οὐ μή ποτέ τις σε βροτῶν γνώμη παρελάσῃ*. The combination has evidently worked its way up from familiar language. So it occurs in the mouth of the Scythian archer Ar. Thesmoph. 1108: *οὐκὲν μή λαλήσι σὺ*.

² *οὐκ—οὐκ ἤθελσαν συστρατεύειν*;

³ Professor Goodwin has assured me that his views are not so definite as I have represented them to be, and the only apology I can offer for the wrong I have unintentionally done him is to reproduce the language of his *Moods and Tenses*, p. 187: 'The rules given above consider the subjunctive there [*οὐ μή τοῦτο γένηται*] a relic of the common Homeric subjunctive (§ 87) [where it is said to have the force of a weak future], and explain the fut. in § 89, 2 [*οὐ μή λαλήσεις*] by the principle stated in § 25, 1 N. 5 [where the fut. ind. with *μή* is said to express a prohibition]—*οὐ μή* having the same force of a strong single negative in both constructions.' From this statement I inferred, wrongly as it seems, that the strong single negative was the result of the fusion of *οὐ γένηται* and *μή γένηται*, of *οὐ λαλήσεις* and *μή λαλήσεις*, and so attributed to Professor Goodwin the assumption of a genesis which is at all events intelligible.

cf. 7. 53; οὐ μὴ . . ἐσβάλλωσιν Thuc. 4. 95, cf. 5. 69; οὐ μὴ ποθ' ἀλῶ Ar. Ach. 662; οὐ μὴ ποτε δέξεται Plat. Phaedo 105 D, cf. Phaedr. 227 D, 260 E, etc.; οὐ μὴ κρατηθῶ Xen. Cyr. 5. 1, 17, cf. 3. 2, 8; cf. οὐδεὶς μὴ ποθ' εὖρη κατ' ἐμέ οὐδὲν ἐλλειφθέν Dem. 18. 246.

2. rarely present, οὐ μὴ ποτε . . φυγόντες . . ἐπεύχωνται θεοῖς (v. l. ἐπεύξωνται) Soph. O. C. 1024—(φυγόντες will serve as if=οὐ μὴ φύγωσι); οὐ μὴ δύνηται Xen. Cyr. 8. 1, 5 (v. l. δυνήσεται), cf. also An. 2. 2, 12, Hier. 11. 15; οὐ μὴ εἰσίσῃς (εἴσει εἰς, Bekk.) Isae. 8. 24; οὐ μὴ οἶός τ' ᾗς Plat. Rep. 1. 341 C; οὐ γὰρ μὴ δυνατὸς δ Id. Phil. 48 D.

οὐ μὴ with subj. is commonly explained by the ellipsis of a verb or phrase of fear or apprehension; cf. οὐ γὰρ ἦν δεινὸν . . μὴ ἀλφ' κοτε Hdt. 1. 84, cf. 7. 235, Ar. Eccl. 650, Xen. Comm. 2. 1, 25, etc., Plat. Apol. 28 B, Phaedo 84 B, Gorg. 520 D, Rep. 5. 465 B. In many passages, however, fear or apprehension would be unsuitable or unnatural (as Eur. I. T. 18¹, I. A. 1465²), and the combination was hardly felt as an ellipsis, as is shown by its use after ὅτι Thuc. 5. 69, 2, Xen. Hell. 4. 2, 3, Plat. Rep. 6. 499 B; after ὥς *since*, Ar. Av. 461, and after ὥστε Plat. Phaedr. 227 D. Notice also that in Dem. 9. 75 δέδοικα is expressed in the *next* clause. The prevalence of the aor., though not unnatural after verbs of fear, would seem to indicate that the original combination was that of a declarative neg. οὐ, *nay!* and a prohibitive subj., which afterwards became a mere phraseological future, showing, however, a special interest in the action. Comp. Engl. *shall*.

b. with fut. indic. οὐ σοι μὴ μεθέσφομαι ποτε Soph. El. 1052, cf. O. C. 177, 849 (for which in oratio obliqua fut. opt. ἐθέσπισεν ὥς οὐ μὴ ποτε πέρσοιεν Soph. Phil. 611; or fut. inf. εἶπεν . . οὐ μὴ ποτε . . εὖ πράξειν πόλιν Eur. Phoen. 1590); οὐ μὴ σ' ἐγὼ περιόψομαι Ar. Ran. 508; οὐ μὴ δυνήσεται Κῦρος εὐρεῖν Xen. Cyr. 8. 1, 5, cf. Hell. 1. 6, 32. A phraseological outgrowth from II.

II. in prohibitions with fut. indic. (chiefly 2d person) οὐ μὴ ἔξεγερῇς τὸν ὑπνῷ κάτοχον (;) Soph. Tr. 978; οὐ μὴ μῦθον ἐπὶ πολλοὺς ἐρέεις (;) Eur. Supp. 1066, cf. Andr. 757, El. 982, Hipp. 213, Bacch. 343; οὐ μὴ πρόσσει τούτοις ἐσκοροδισμένοις (;) Ar. Ach. 166, cf. Nub. 367, Vesp. 397. MS. subjunctives in such passages (*e. g.* σκώψῃς . . ποιήσῃς, Ar. Nub. 296) have generally been changed by editors into

¹ Ἀγάμεμνον, οὐ μὴ ναῦς ἀφορμήσῃ χθονός,
πρὶν ἂν κόρην σὴν Ἴφιγένειαν Ἄρτεμις
λάβῃ σφαγεῖσαν.

² ΚΛΥΤ. ὦ τέκνον, οἶχει; IΦ. καὶ πάλιν γ' οὐ μὴ μὀλω.

fut. indic. The prohibition is continued by καί (Soph. Tr. *l. c.*) or by μηδέ: οὐ μὴ προσοίσεις χεῖρα μηδ' ἄψει πέπλων (;) Eur. Hipp. 606, cf. Ar. Nub. 296, Ran. 298. A positive command is added by ἀλλά: οὐ μὴ λαλήσεις ἀλλ' ἀκολουθήσεις ἐμοί Ar. Nub. 505, cf. Ran. 462, 524, Eur. Bacch. 782; or δέ: οὐ μὴ προσοίσεις χεῖρα βακχεύσεις δ' ἰών, Eur. Bacch. 348, cf. Med. 1151, El. 384.

Elmsley regarded οὐ μὴ with fut. indic. as an impatient question, in which οὐ negatives μὴ, but this would require οὐ—οὐ, cf. Xen. Hell. 5. 2, 33. οὐ and μὴ are sometimes regarded as belonging separately to the fut. either *you will not, nay, you shall not*, (but μὴ with fut. indic. as an imperative is too rare), or *you will not, will you?* in which οὐ anticipates the negative answer to the following question. Perhaps οὐ is an independent negative, *nay*, which introduces a free objection not yet distinctly formulated, while μὴ introduces a question which expects a negative answer, so that an original οὐ, μὴ . . . ; became ultimately οὐ μὴ. Compare the way in which οὐ τί που hovers between question and statement. The rule of Dawes which excludes the use of 1 aor. subj. act. or med. after οὐ μὴ can only be upheld by unreasonable emendations, cf. οὐ μὴ ποτε . . . ἐκφώνω Soph. O. R. 329; οὐ μὴ ἐκπλεύσης (fut. unmetrical) Phil. 381, cf. Ai. 560; οὐ μὴ ποτέ τι ἀπολέση (fut. ἀπολεῖ) Plat. Rep. 10. 609 A; οὐδεὶς μηκέτι μείνη Xen. An. 4. 8, 13.

οὐ and μὴ not unfrequently occur each with its own verb or equivalent. Editors differ with one another and themselves, according as they consider the interrogation to embrace the whole or not. So οὐ σίγα μηδὲν τῶνδ' ἐρεῖς κατὰ πτόλιν; Aesch. S. c. T. 250; οὐ σίγα; μηδὲν τῶνδ' ἐρεῖς κατὰ πτόλιν, or οὐ σίγα; μηδὲν τῶνδ' ἐρεῖς κατὰ πτόλιν; As οὐ expects a positive and μὴ a negative answer, we only have another phase of a common law of grouping (positive followed by equivalent negative), and gain nothing for the explanation of οὐ μὴ, cf. Soph. Ai. 75, Tr. 1183, O. R. 637, Eur. Hipp. 498, Hel. 438, Plat. Conv. 175 A.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.